

REMARKS

The present Amendment is in response to the Examiner's Office Action mailed June 26, 2007. Claims 3, 11, and 20 are cancelled and claims 1, 8, and 18 are amended. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-19, 21, and 22 are now pending in view of the above amendments.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. In addition, Applicants request that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicant's understanding and discussion of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner's understanding.

I. Allowed Subject Matter

The Examiner's allowance of claims 13-17 is appreciated. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the careful review and allowance of those claims.

The Applicant submits the following comments concerning the Examiner's statements of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter in the Office Action. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that the claimed invention of claims 13-17 is patentable over the prior art, but respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance as set forth in the Office Action. Applicant submits that it is the claim as a whole, rather than any particular limitation, that makes each of the claims allowable. No single limitation should be construed as the reason for allowance of a claim because it is each of the elements of the claim that makes it allowable. Therefore, Applicants do not concede that the reasons for allowable subject matter given by the Examiner are the only reasons that make, or would make, the claims allowable and do not make any admission or concession concerning the Examiner's statement in the Office Action.

II. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

A. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejects claims 1-12 and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Golback* (United States Patent No. 5,812,377). Because *Golback* does not teach or suggest each and every element of the rejected claims, the Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in view of the following remarks.

Claims 3, 11, and 20 are cancelled. Therefore, the rejection of those claims is moot.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that "Neither the references cited nor the cited references teach, suggest, or [make] obvious in combination of the enclosure having a card having first and second side edges and defining at least one cutout formed along at least half of the length of the card and having opposing edges and the at least one cutout being interposed between the first and second side edges so that when the functional module is received in the card cage, the first and second side edges of the card are supported by the first and second card guides, respectively, and the opposing edges of the at least one cutout defined by the card are supported by the third card guide."

Claims 1, 8, and 18 have been amended to include similar elements to that indicated as allowable by the Examiner. Thus, claims 1, 8, and 18 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth in the Examiner's reasons for allowance of claims 13-17. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 8, and 18 be withdrawn. Claims 2 and 4-7 depend from claim 1, claims 9-10 and 12 depend from claim 8, and claims 19, 20, and 21 depend from claim 18. Therefore, claims 2, 4-7, 9, 10, 12, 19, 20, and 21 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 8, and 18.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant believes that the claims as amended are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 26th day of September, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/David A. Jones/ Reg. 50,004
DAVID A. JONES
Registration No. 50,004
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913
Telephone: (801) 533-9800

W:\15436\75.1.1\KJN0000004382V001.doc